

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/069,313	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ARMITAGE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeanine A Goldberg	<b>Art Unit</b> 1634	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jeanine A Goldberg.

(2) Michael Krawzsenek.

**Status of Application:** after election

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 25 November 2003

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 _____ (Examiner/SPE Signature)	_____ (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)
--	--

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the applicant because the claims submitted in response to the restriction requirement did not appear to match the claims which the examiner had prepared the restriction requirement. The examiner indicated that she was working from an amended sheet of claims. The applicant indicated he would cancel all previous pending claims and submit claims he wished examined in the instant application..